

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,211	03/31/2004	Seyed Jafar Jafarian-Tehrani	LMRX-P034/P1233	7310
32986	7590 11/01/2006		EXAMINER	
IPSG, P.C.			PASCHALL, MARK H	
P.O. BOX 70 SAN JOSE.	00640 CA 95170-0640		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3742	
•			DATE MAILED: 11/01/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No. Applicant(s)					
		10/816,211	JAFARIAN-TEHRANI, SEYED JAFAR				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mark H. Paschall	3742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHI0 - Exte after - If N0 - Failu Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAPAINSONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period warre to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ARANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D. (35 U.S.C. 8 133)				
Status		•					
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 Au	igust 2006.					
,	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
3)	,						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims						
	Claim(s) 39-59 is/are pending in the application	•					
٠,٣	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>39-59</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
/	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in this National Stage				
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Λ <del>+1</del> 36b	.w(a)						
Attachmen	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	A) Thomas and Commercial	(DTO 412)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal P	atent Application				
ı ape	A 140(S)/IVIAII DALC	6) 🔲 Other:					

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 39-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sneh in view of Mitrovic. Claims are unpatentable for the same reasons advanced in paragraph 1 on page 2 of the previous office action.

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08-17-2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's remarks advance that neither Sneh nor Mitrovic teach monitoring of the status of a component in a plasma system. However, the patent to Mitrovic was applied for teaching monitoring the status of the impedance of a plasma processing system and this does include the status of the load of the system, which includes the components such as the electrodes of the system. See figure 2 in Mitrovic. Also see paragraphs 30-32 on page 3 in Mitrovic which teach monitoring other impedance of a chuck of a system, if only a chuck is used in the processing. Mitrovic specifically mentions in paragraph 0030 that multiple frequency are measured and are stored and further defines that a mathematical model of the impedance of the processor is obtained, as set forth in the instant claims. Note that the impedance of the

Art Unit: 3742

components of a processing system, as set forth in Mitrovic, does comprise monitoring the status of a component, barring further description of the same in the instant claims. Applicant's instant figure 4 clearly depicts the model taught in the Mitrovic system and one of ordinary skill in plasma process in would find it beneficial to adapt the Sneh system to include the models of the impedances of the system for Mitrovic, to effect a clearer model of the impedances of the system which do include the impedances of the electrodes and supports, as claimed.

### Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 3742

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark H. Paschall whose telephone number is 571 272-4784. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am - 3pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on 571-272-4777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark H Paschall Primary Examiner Art Unit 3742

Мр